G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

File No. / S P-07

1907

(Henry)

Serial Nos.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Affairs of the Akalsha Khadru
Darga at Chandrapatna

Ordered to be filed

(Vide page 40)

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 - 28-1-19

G R. S. III-1]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Mercy)

NOTES.

File No 158-07

FILE HEADING

Affairs of the Akhalkha Thakurs
Darga at Chandrapatna

From

No. Dated Received

Diary No.] Enclos Spare Copies [Serial No

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

NOTES AND ORDERS

NOTES—First Sheet

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. 190

An English Precis of the Vernacular correspondence of the years 1873-74.

Complaints of the mis-management of the Akhal Sha Khadri Darga at Chennapatna having been received, orders were issued more than once from the Taluk and the Sub Divisional authorities directing the prompt payment by the makkandar, Sultan mohadin Sha Khadri of the allowances due to the several hakdars.

Flag 9) On 4th February 1874, Sharpha Bee along with some others complained of the non-disbursement of her allowance by the makkandar

Flag 9) On 22d February 1874, the makkandar reported to the Taluk office that Gous Sha Khadri and three other hakdars declined to receive their allowances till one Sharpha Bee whose name was not mentioned in the

"Batwade" Patti, was also paid and that under orders of closet Sub Dist. officer, these allowances has been kept in deposit.

Syed Ali and Hussain Sha Khadri went on complaining that the makkandar was lax in his morals, that he was making a private use of the income and that the hakdars were not being regularly paid. Hag

The matter finally came up for enquiry before the Amildar.

In his deposition dated 23rd May 1874, the makkandar states that Sahib Pacha left behind him two wives — Sharpha Bee and Sharipha Bee, that on Sahib Pacha's death, his allowance of ~~Rs 5-8-0~~ was being paid to his son Hussain Pacha by his 1st wife. Hag 2

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

That since Hussain Pacha's death, a sum of Rs 3-8-0 was being paid to his wife Guner Bee and son Buran Pacha, the balance being paid to Sahib Pacha's 2nd wife Sharipha Bee, and that nothing was being paid to Sharpha Bee. He further states that Guner Bee was the Nika wife of Hussain Pacha. When questioned as to why in spite of the document (ಸಂ ೧೪೫) executed by Sahib Pacha (which authorizes Sharpha Bee to receive Rs 3-10-8 and Sharipha Bee 1-13-4, as their Mahar or Dowry) he was not paying anything to Sharpha Bee, he says he has not been informed of it.

(Flag M)

(Flag N) A memo signed by the under-mentioned gentlemen purports to say that Guner Bee was neither married nor underwent Nika ceremony.

1) Hussain Sha Khadri — 60 years
2) Mohadin ——— 45 -do—
3) Mupkar Pirau —— 60 -do—
4) Mastan Sahe —— 30 -do—

In his Report dated 7 Oct 8

6th June 1874, the then Amildar Mr. Venkataraungiengar states that on a complaint from Sharipha Bee that in spite of her husband's ಅಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ the makkandar was paying her share of the allowance to her son's prostitute (ಕೆಟ್ಟ ಹೆಂಗಸು), an enquiry was held during which the witnesses other than the makkandar stated that the woman was not the complainant's daughter-in-law but was in her son's keeping and as such was not legal heir and that the makkandar was paying her in consideration of the fact that she was with him in his house. He suggested that seeing that the 2nd wife Sharipha Bee was getting

her allowance, it was but fair that the 1st wife should also be paid.

The then Sub Divl Officer captain Ludlow having inspected the

Flag E) makkan, directed under the Dy. Commr's. order that Sharpha Bee's allowance be paid monthly to her or her Agent (Inspection notes Dy 31-7-1874

Sharpha Bee along with Sharpha

Flag F) Bee went on complaining that the makkandar was not giving their allowance though orders were issued by the Sub-divl and H. authorities

The petitions having been referred through the Sub-divl officer to the Amildar, the latter reported that

Flag R) Sharpha Bee was entitled to the allowa but the makkandar states that her name was not mentioned in the Boo ward and that she was not fou

In his petition dated 3rd October 1874, the makkandar suggested that the petitioners might be directed to proceed against the Varasdars to establish their claim if any

As complaint petitions were pouring in against the makkandar, the Sub Officer directed the Huildar to hold an exhaustive enquiry and intimate the result to him.

The Amildar inspected the makkan and examined some witnesses.

In his Deposition of 4th January 1875, Subhanna, muttsoody of the makkan states that after Patcha Kadri, his son Hussain Pacha was drawing the allowance for a year, that after him, the allowance was being paid to Jumer Bee who the makkandar said, was Hussain Pacha's widow, that Rs 2 per month (Flags

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

were being given some 4 or 5 months to Shariphambut latterly nothing was given to her. He further states that Ameer Bee was living in the makkandar's house and that he did not know why she was there and what relationship existed between them-

Flag I) In his Kyphiyath dated 18th Janry. 1875, the makkandar states that he never at any time paid the allowance to Sharipha Bee, that the full amount was being paid to Buran Packa, son of Hussain Packa and that there was no entry in the Acquittance roll to show that Shariphe Bee was getting 2 As-

Flag U) The Amildar having submitted his report, the then Sub Asst Collector (Sir P N Krishnamoorthy) enquired whether Sharpha Bee and Shariffa Bee had been legally married to [illegible]

File No: of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

The Amildar Mr Venkatarangiengar (Flag U
submitted his detailed report which
goes fully into the facts of the case.
He reports that the two women had been legally married, & that
arrangements had been
made for the "Shadi" or marriage of Hussain
Pacha with one Syda Bibi daughter of maho-
madan but that the former died on the day of
his marriage, That the local enquiry went
to show that gunner Bee was not as alleged,
even the Nikka wife of Hussain Pacha but
was merely in his keeping, that Buran
Pacha was not therefore the lawful issue
of his body, and that the allowance claimed
being "mahar" of Sharpha Bee, even her lawful
son could not rightly claim it under Mahomedan
Law during her life-time and much-less,
her illegitimate grand-son Buran Pacha.

On the makkandar's petition Dy
march 1875 the Sub Divl Officer observes
that if Buran Pacha was the legal son

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

of Hussain Pacha, the allowance should be paid to him and if otherwise it should be paid to the widow.

Hagr)

The makkandar again petitioned the Sub Asst. Officer stating that Buwa Pacha son of Hussain Pacha was drawing the allowance and suggesting that if the 2 widows were entitled to maintenance they might be directed to resort to Court.

Capt. Ludlow ordered that he would hear the makkandar and the persons complained of by him.

In reply to this, the Amildar

Hagr) submitted another detailed report — wherein he draws the distinction between "mahar" and English Dowry or Hindu Stridhana and states that Gunen Bee was not at all married to Hussain Pacha

During February 1876, Capt. L. C. examined some witnesses at [illegible]

Channapatna.

The makkandar deposes that Gunner Bee was the nikka wife of Hussain Pacha, that his father celebrated the nikka marriage in that makkan some 13 or 14 years ago, that though it was usual for the Khazi to maintain a record of such marriages, no documents were forthcoming in support of his allegation, that 2 witnesses viz Gous Sha Khadri and Kasim Sahb – the latter was dead – had seen the marriage and that many others also witnessed the Nikka but he has did not remember their names.

Gous Sha Khadri corroborates the above statement and adds that Rs 25/- were stipulated as "mahar" to the bride on the occasion.

Syed Ali deposes that Gunner Bee was not as alleged, the nikka wife of Hussain Pacha, that she was Sharipha Bee's

Hagg.

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

sister, that after Sharipha's marriage with Sahib Pacha, gunner Bee went and lived with her sister and Brother-in-law and that she and (her sister's step-son) Hussain Pacha being youths, loved each other and their issue was Buran Pacha.

Hagiy) On 9th February 1876, Captn Ludlow passed the following order at camp Chamapa

"From the evidence taken before me, I am
"not satisfied that the Nikka ceremony
"was performed and until satisfactory
"proof of that fact is adduced, the legiti
"of Buran Padshah cannot be ~~so~~ accepte
"2 until Buran Badshash can prove the
"Nikka marriage of Hussain Padshash, the
"stipend paid to Shahib Pabbha during
"his life-time must be paid rateably
"to his two widows Sheripha Bee and Shirat Bee.

Submitted for orders

AV 28.7.09

File No of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9 07

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

An English Precis of the Vernacular correspondence of the year 1903.

In their mutchalika executed on 12 th January 1903 before the Sub Divl officer Ahamed Ali, the hakkdars have agreed To devote for educational and other useful purposes the stipend of the under-mentioned persons who died heirless:-

	Rs As Ps.
1) Gous Sha Khadri —	5-8-0
2) Harzarath Bee —	2-11-0
3) Harzarath Pacha —	4-10-0
	12-13-0

Flag A) Syed Buran Badsha Khadri is one of the signatories.

Flag B) One Kilandar Peera deposes on the 8 th January 1903 that his step-mother Sharpha Bee executed a will on 4 th July 1896 desiring that her stipend of Rs 3-10-8 should continue to his son — Sahib Pacha, that he did not personally know whether Buran's mother and Hussain Pacha were legally married, that he had heard it said that th

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

not married through Nikka ceremonys and prays that the allowance might be given to his son.

The will is a registered document executed by Sharpha Bee at the age of 80 wherein she desires that her allowance should be continued to her step-son Kalandar Peer's eldest son Sahib Pacha (Flag C)

She is said to have died in Feby. 1894

In a Hukum Dy 9th Febry 1890 it is directed that as per Karar of Sharipha Bee, one-half of her allowance should go to Syed Ali during her life-time and after her death, to her legal heirs.

On 12th Janry 1903, Khaja Pacha brother of Kalander Peera states that he did not know if there was any legal marriage between Buran's mother and Hussain Pacha (Kalender Peera and Khaja Pacha were the uncles of Buran Pacha) (Flag D)

" Sukar Usman Sab and Makkandar (Flag E

GPB—3,000—25 9-07

Syed mahomed Hussain Badshah state that gunen Bee and Hussain Pacha had been married according to their Shastra

Flag F) In their mahazar dy 10th August 1899, the makkandar Syed mahamed Sultan mohadu Sha Khadri and other hissedars state that Sharpha Bee, 1st wife of Saheb Pacha had two sons, that the 1st son Syed Pacha having died (heirless), the karawan of Rs 3-10-8 was made out in the name of 2d son Hussain Pacha, that the latter having died, the karawan was transferred to Sharipha Bee's name and after her death her grand-son Burau Pacha is the hakdar

Flag G) The mahazar dy 15th Sept 1900 was drawn up at the request of Burau Pacha He states that during his minority, some persons ill-disposed towards him had stigmatized his name and regn. the signature of persons in con-

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

the fact that he is the son of Hussain Badsha.

In the Baramaal List of the (Hag.)
Akhal Shah Khadri Darga, Mr. Ahamed Ali has recorded that satisfactory evidence has been given to prove that Buran Pacha Khadri was the legitimate grandson of the deceased Bibi and that the latter's allowance of Rs 3-10-8 shall be continued to him,

Submitted for orders

28.7.09 28/7/09

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. of 190

Note contd

As per orders of His Highness, Pro No 404-0, dated 16th March 1908, were issued, sanctioning the disbursement ~~of a Rs~~ to Biran Sha Khadri of a sum of Rs 5-8-0 per mensem, being the allce enjoyed by his grandfather Gous Sha Khadri from the Akhal Sha Khadri Dargah at Chennapatna. Syed Mohomed Hussein Bateha Khadri, Hakdar and member of the Dargah has presented petitions to His Highness and to this Office praying that the allce referred to above should not be paid to the recipient on the reason that the latter did not establish his relationship with Gous Sha Khadri as directed by the Chief Commissioner vide ;-4, and that the allowance in question ~~was~~ is one of the items directed to be brought under scale for effecting periodical repairs [illegible] These points were brought [illegible] Government [illegible]

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat.

were passed in favor of Buran Sha Khadri.

An endorsement is therefore submitted declining to modify the orders already passed in the matter 427/15.4.08

Subd to the 2nd Councillor / Ghulam Kasim Khan 15/4/08

Ld 15/4/08

592/16.4.08 The Petn. cannot be summarily rejected. The hak of Buran Sha Khadri is challenged. Petn. may be sent to D.C for early enquiry & report. Please see the enclosure 1/1 to the Petn 16/4/08

Received 16/4/08

F. J. D/

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

established his claim, he is not entitled to the said allowance. With reference to this point, I beg to invite kind reference to the reading portion of Government Order No. 3886-8 Date Mwx 7 36-94 the 16th June 1904 (a printed copy of which is in the file marked with slip R) containing the long Memo of Mr. Ahmed Ali who was then the Assistant Commissioner in Charge of the Memnapatna Taluk. That officer refers in his Memo to the Chief Commissioner's order of 1876 (relied on by the present Complainant) and states as follows —

" In Chief Commissioner's Pro. No. 6478-98, dated 29th October 1875, the said Buraun Sha Khan

File No.	of 190	Muzrai Secretaria

established his claim, he is not entitled to the said al-lowance. With reference to this point, I beg to invite kind refer-ence to the reading portion of Government Order No. 3886-8 dated Mur 7 36-94 the 16th June 1904 (a printed copy of which is in the file marked with slip R) containing the long memo of Mr. Ahmed Ali who was then the Assistant Commissioner in Charge of the Mannapatna Taluk. That officer refers in his Memo to the Chief Commissioner's order of 1876 (relied on by the present Complainant) and states as follows —

" In Chief Commissioner's Pro No. 6478-98, dated 29th September 87 the said Buran Sha Khas

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

Muz. 8 A J

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

was referred to the Joint for
establishing the rights of the
to the allowance. From a careful
enquiry held by me on the spot
it has been satisfactorily established
that the present claimant Syed
Burhan Sha Khadri is the
eldest son of Hussain Peer
Respectable Mahomedans of the
place have come forward to
evidence to the legal rights of
of the petitioners father Syed
Sha Sha Jan Khadri
recommended to be granted
view that Syed Burhan Sha

File No of 190 Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25 9-07

Muz. 8 A]

Page (27)

Muzrai Secretariat	File No	of 190

Surfa Bibi be transferred to the
name of Bura [illegible] Wa K[illegible],
the legal grandson of the deceased
Bibi" The Government [illegible] the
the recommendation in the
Pro. of the 16th June 1904, referred
to above

Subsequently, [illegible] 1905 [illegible] Wa
Sha Khadri applied for the grant of
the allowance of Rs. 580 [illegible]
to the deceased Syed Sha Khadri
being his brothers [illegible] or
The petition [illegible]
to the Collector [illegible]
[illegible] to the [illegible]
but the [illegible]
[illegible]

File No	of 190	Muzrai Secretariat

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

He then appealed against that order, and the matter having gone up before His Highness His Highness was pleased to sanction the allowance but without retrospective effect, as a penalty for his having slept over his right for such a long time Vide G.O. No. 1-4014-dated 16th. March 1908 (marked with Slip Q).

Under these circumstances orders are solicited as to whether the present petition challenging the hak of Duran Sha, a resident Khadya should again be sent to the Collector, for re-inquiry for report

The same petitioner Duran Sha Khadya submitted His Petition praying that the previous orders sanctioning the

File No.	of 190	Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muz. 8 A]

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. of 190

named allowance of Rs 5-8-0 to Buran Sha Khadri may be held in abeyance pending disposal of the Memorial already presented by him. On this, the Private Secretary to H H has called for the Submission of the papers in the Case.

432
20 4 08

Submitted to the 2nd Councillor

Thirumalacharlu

20th April 1908

I should like to hear the Petr in the presence of Buran Sha Khadri. Fresh facts may be forthcoming

H H M
21/4/08

Please give notice fixing 2nd May for the hearing

21/4/08

Note continued.

Notices were issued to Burau Sha Khadri and Syed Mohomed Hussein Bacha Khadri (through the Amildars of the Talukes in which they are residing) directing them to appear before Govt. on the 2nd May 1908 (tomorrow today). The notices have not yet been returned with service on the parties.

Burau Sha Khadri has petd. this Office (received by post today) in which he says that he is in receipt of the notice sent from this Office. He says that none of his Petns is pending disposal in this Office, that on his representation to H.H. the Maharaja praying for the grant of the allowance to them, orders were passed sanctioning it that he has been receiving the same for the past 3 months. He adds that

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

As the papers in the case have been called for by His Highness the Maharaja's Order No 2509 dated 12th April 1908, the File is submitted

451/25.08

Submitted to the Dewan thro' the P.S. to H.H.

Seen HHM 25/08

Chandrasekhara 2/5/08

8942/6.5.08

* Ship $

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

Syed Mohomed Hussein Bacha Khadri says that he too is not well, that he will be busy throughout this month on account of the Urus & and says that some date in the month of June may be fixed for hearing him & the other man.

Separate notices fixing the of June 1908 is submtd. for approval

Submtd 4.7.1908 | Muzrai Secy's remarks:—

Syed Mohomed Hussein Bacha Khadri was heard by the 2nd Councillor today. From the oral statements made by the Petr., the 2nd Councillor thinks it ~~does not appear~~ necessary to investigate the matter further the claim and for this purpose both the parties will be heard and the papers submitted.

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

As the papers in this case have been called for by Hishness the [illegible] O.M. no 2509 dated 4th [illegible] 1908, the file is sent [illegible]

451 / 2.5.08.

Submitted to the [illegible] this the [illegible]

Seen 2/5/08

2/5/08

8942 / 6.5.08

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

(29)

Submitted to His Highness.

As called for in Private Secretary's memo No.2609 dated the 14th April 1908, I submit herewith the file of papers relating to the petition of Syed Mahomed Hussein Batcha Khadri, Hakdar and member of the Akhal Sha Khadri Darga at Channapatna, protesting against the grant to one Syed Buran Sha Khadri of an allowance of Rs.5-8-0 per mensem enjoyed by his grandfather Ghaus Sha Khadri from the said Darga.

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja.

Subject.

Protest of Syed Mahomed Hussain Bacha Khadri against the grant of an allowance to one Syed Buran Sha Khadri of Chennapatana.

Order.

May be disposed of by the Nyayi Dept.

By order

SM

Post to 11th July 1908 for hearing before the 2nd

22/5/08

1/6/08

Muzrai Secretariat	File No. of 190

Note continued

Notices were accordingly issued to the contending parties at Chennapatna to appear before Court on the 11th July or

Syed Buran Sha Khadri in - whose favour orders of Court were passed directing the payment of certain allowance from the Akhal Sha Khadri Dargah at Chennapatna has memorialized H H. the Maharaja Suttenly complaining against Syed Mahomed Hussain Badsha Khadri who is the appellant in this case. The memorial has been forwarded to this Office for disposal

× (Slip a)

Submitted

Please get the entire Record relating to this. The case is now for hearing on the 11th July 1, st Draft cards please.

AM

11/5/08

File No. of 190 | Muzrai Secretariat

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

25th Saturday

Muzrai Secretariat | File No. of 190

Note cont^d

In the course of the hearing on the 11th July 1908, Syed Mohomed Hussein Badsha Khadri, one of the hissedars and a member on the Managing Committee of the Akhal Sha Khadri Dargah at Chennapatna, referred to the late Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No. 6478/98, dated 29th September 1876, and stated that those Proceedings made mention of Capt Ludlow's order disallowing the claim of Buran Sha Khadri on account of his being the Mogituna to grandson of Sherfoo Bee, one of the hissedars of the Dargah and accordingly directed that the said Buran Sha Khadri should be referred to the Civil Courts for establishing his right. The deponent has, with a previous petition to this Office, submitted a copy of the Chief Commissioner's Pro: referred to.

Sub^d

538
Rev

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat

No. 3775/22nd July 1908. Encl. 1 Filed 2 office notes.

Forwarded unofficially to the Secretary to the Govt of H H the Maharaja of Mysore, General and Revenue Depts, with the request that the Chief Commr's Proceedings referred to above and the connected papers, if any, may be kindly forwarded to this Office for reference.

C Balasundaramayya
22nd July 1908.

MYSORE GOVERNMENT 494 30/7/08 MUZRAI SECR-

No. R. 659 with encl.

The Chief Commr's Progs and the Connected papers asked for in the above are not forthcoming in the Records of this office.

29th July 08

for Secretary to Govt.
Gen. & R. Depts

Await reply from D.C.

307

GPB—3,000—25-9-07

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Muz File No. 158 of 1907

Serial No.

To, The Dy Commr, Bangalore Dist

D o dated 22d July 1908.

Calls for Capt Ludlow's order and the chief Comm's. Proceedings of the year 1846 in connection with the claim of Buraa Sha Khadri for the allowance of Rs 5-8 per mensem from the Akhal Sha Khadri Dargah at channapatna

From. the same officer.

D-o. dated August 1908

forwards a copy of the chief Comm's. Proceedings and reports that the vernacular file containing Captain Ludlow's order could not be traced out and that a search would be made in the Taluk records.

To. the same officer.

Docket Dy 4-3-09.

forwards the petition from Syed Mahomed Hussain Basha Khadri and calls for the order referred to above.

From. the same officer.

Letter no. 118 Dy 25-5-09

Reports that the order is not forthcoming either in the Sub Divn or Taluk offices

Submitted for orders

KV 31/5/09. 4/6/1909

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Revenue File No. 158 of 1907

Serial No.

The question for decision now is — whether or not Bhai Sher Shah is the legitimate grandson of Sahib Padshah Khanda alias Bhai Sher Shah and Hussain Padshah and [illegible] legally married.

In this connection there was a dispute between Sharfo Bibi and Bhai Sher Shah in 1876 when Captain Ludlow after examining the witnesses has recorded in the letter appeal that there was satisfactory evidence of Nika and that Bhai Sher Shah was thereby established legitimacy.

In 1902 the Khondkar has examined some witnesses and disputed the opinion that Bhai Sher Shah is legitimate and has removed the management of Sharfo Bibi's property from him.

In the memorial under disposal the Memorialist Mahomed Bhai Sher Shah says that the deceased Bhai Sher Shah has recorded a will in favour of his grandson.

In the case of the Mortgage and Sale Deed the Hon'ble Sir [illegible] Stone's Sher Shah's wife and that after the death of the witnesses remaining there was no dispute between the brothers and that it was stated that Sharfo Bibi's [illegible] (Page 8) that Sharfo Bibi's [illegible]

Note—Contn. sheet.

R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mug File No. 458 of 1907

Serial No.

from to Bara Shankudi, the Baraa-Shankudi
the Government has executed a lease deed
transferred the Zamin Shankudi's and there
Mahazar Records in which B 12 13 Shankudi
Bara and that transfer Bara Shankudi
is entitled from claiming Ghoma Shankudi's
Mahazar of B 5 0.

that the concerned to be copy the pro-
ceedings of 1896 and 1903 before a Magistrate which
dispute is concerned therefore Mahazar on Petition
dated by A. Venkatachalam.

Applicant's agent has B Cer a Shankudi about
the receipts of the letters Nos. 76 of 1308 of 20/12/97 & 6/1/98 and
also to produce the accounts and report if stated
in the Mahazar, Ghoma Shankudi's daughter's
son was getting Tari collection receipt. after his
death it deposed. The B Cer a Shankudi of
two after the death of Ghoma Shankudi and
thereafter Bala Baraa-Shankudi assembled
applied to the Mahazar.

BT
1/7/1909

Submitted with Memorandum
a Precis
AV
29.7.09

Submitted
W
28/8/09

G.
2/8/1909

Submitted with Memorandum
BT
31/7/1909

Submitted with the
Memorandum
BT
3/8/1909

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPL—50,000—18-5-08

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mins File No. 158 of 1907

Serial No.

Draft as revised submitted
Revise & resubmitted for draft
178/1907

GHS

W 25809

To, The Dy Commr, Bangalore Dist

Letter no 402 Dy 7 & 1909

Calls for further inform on the subj.

From, the Same officer,

Letter no 23 Dy 14 1 1910

Submits report called for in the above

The Dy Commr reports that the Vandedurg Commr's letters are not forthcoming & suggests that a search may be made in the Sectt records

Hag x)

A Copy of the will said to have been executed by Ghouse Sha khadre in Dec 187 in favor of his daughter's son Sahib Peer, has been submitted

It is further reported that as the old Baramans of the makkan are not forthcoming, no inform can be given as to who was getting the allowance after Ghouse Sha khadre and when and why it lapsed -

Hag n)

The makkandar states that the allowance of Ghouse Sha khadre, after the latter's death :-

NOTE—Contn sheet

GPB—50 000—10-5-08

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. /S of 190.

Serial No:

Letters for the Arabian mail. Brown Sha Khan Hadji that he has been receiving his claim since the death of Ghouse Sha Khadri and his wife

submitted for orders

AU (162)
12/4/12
Submitted
27/2/12

Received from Mr. A Subramanya Iyer, when he handed over charge, on transfer.
21.2.12

Syed Mahmed Hussain Bacha Khadri of Chinnapatna prays for an early disposal of the Ca

Submitted for orders

41(139) 27/2/12

Please submit a fortnight hence
28.2.12

Submitted

Keep the case AU 21/2 on file for 26

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 190

Serial No.

This is one of the old files which has been pending in the office for a long time past and which has not been submitted for final orders for lack of information. In the meanwhile the person at whose instance further enquiry is being carried on is no more and no person seems to be interested in pushing things in the matter. Bowan Sha had has now been in receipt of the pension for more than 11 years and as the materials now before us are not sufficient to question his title thereto and as no person seems to be sufficiently interested in pushing the matter further in, I would humbly suggest that further enquiry may be stopped and the papers lodged.

Jd
C. T. G

2nd member)

May the Revenue Secretariat records connected with this case be returned to the Dy. Comm. Bangalore?

Draft returning the papers is put up for approval and orders.

29/1/96

GDB—95,1-2-1896—140

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 958 of 1917.

Serial No.

Vide that the documents & deed now are here Come forward with any claim, the matter may be filed. The Ver. Records being returned D.R.

AMT
2-9-19.

orders passed already on this vide 3rd Member order dt 12-8-19

Vr. Mg. 5.9.19 Ordery

AMT
5-9-19.

Sub is answered in appl. to the draft- pursuance Sd 5/9

Sd AMT 6.9.19

To The Dy. Commr Bangalore with. No. 927 dt. 10.9.1919.

Returns the Ver Records Connected with the Case as no further enquiry in the matter deemed necessary

VII 16/11

D 912

190 Dy 158-0

From Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug District

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore Genl Secl Depts (Mugrai)

Dated 14 } Nov 1910
Despatched }

Received

General No.

M.S No.

Enclosure No. 1 Copy & will + 1 file ser separ

Secys letter No 402
M.S. 158—07
17th August 1909

Submitting a report re the claim of Buran Shah Khadri for the monthly allowance of Rs 5-8-0 enjoyed by Ghouse Shah-dri, from the Akkal Shah Khadri Dargah at Chennapatna

as continue note
BL 16/11/10 16/11/10

GPB—70 reams—27 12 09

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Bangalore, 14th November 1910.

B.J.Kumaraswami Naik, Esq., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

To

C.S.Thasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,
Offg: Secretary to the Government of H.H.the
Maharaja of Mysore, General and Revenue
Departments.

Sir,

Referring to correspondence ending with your letter No.402/M.F.158-07 dated the 7th August 1909 regarding the claim of Buren Sha Khadri for a monthly allowance of Rs.5-8-0 enjoyed by Ghouse Sha Khadri, from the Anekal Shakhadri Darga at Chandapura, I have the honor to state that the Nandidroog Commissioner's letters copies of which are called for in the above are not found in the records of this office, and that they seem to be in the records of the Secretariat, being communications from the Nandidroog Division Commissioner to the Chief Commissioner.

2. A copy of the registered will said to have been executed by Ghouse Sha Khadri in December 1876, in favor of his daughter's son Sahib Peer is herewith submitted.

3. The information as to who was getting the allowance after Ghouse Shakhadri and when and why it lapsed is not available as the old accounts containing the Barawards of the Makkan are not forthcoming. These accounts were being maintained by Makkandar Syed Mahomed Sultan Mohideen Sha Khadri up to 1904, when the Makkan was brought under Government management. When questioned by the Amildar the Makkandar stated that he handed over the accounts to the Taluk Office some 7 years ago, and that he did not obtain a receipt therefor. The Amildar reports that there is no reference to show that the accounts were received into the Taluk Cutcherry records.

(46

4. The Makkandar has however, stated in his letter to the Amildar dated 1st November 1909 that the allowance which Ghous Shakhadri was getting, was, after his death, be.. utilized for the repairs of the Darga.

5. Buran Sha Khadri says in his statement before the Amildar that he has been asserting his claim since the death of Ghouse Shakhadri and his wife.

6. The vernacular records together with the review petition and the subsequent correspondence ending Closepet Subvision Officer's yadi No.713 dated 30th November 1909 are rewith submitted.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

for Deputy Commissioner.

G.R.S. 29A]

190 158-07

From

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To
The Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore Dt.

Dated

Despatched 4.3.09

Received

General No. 1253

No.

Enclosure No.

In continuation of this Office
No. 687, dated 4th August 1908,
has the honor to forward herewith
another petition received from Syed
Mohomed Hussein Bateha Khadr
Hakdar and member on the
Committee of Management of the
Akhal Sha Khadri Darga at
Chennapatna, praying that the
disbursement of the allces to Thimm
sandra Buran Sha Khadri may be
ordered to be kept in abeyance
till his petn of His Highness is disposed

2. The Deputy Commissioner
is requested to report the result
of the search instituted in the Record

132 Dy 16.1.09
921 Dy 16.2.09

of the Chennapatna Taluk Office for the correspondence that led to the passing of Capt Ludlow's order disallowing the claim of Busan Sha Khadri.

3 The favour of an early reply is requested.

By order,

Dft)

Asst Secretary
by 20-10-09

1908-09 dccy 158-0

From
The Deputy commissioner
Bangalore District

To
The Secretary to the
Government of Madras
General & Revenue Depart

Dated 25th January 1909

Despatched 26

Received

General No.
Ms No. 118

Enclosure No.

Secretary Board to
G.O. of 14th August 19

---

states that the records
in the passing of captain
Sidlows order declaring
the claim of Rowan Sha
Khadri of the Khal Sha
Khadri of Channapatna
are not forthcoming in
the Board Sub Division
office or with the Channap
atna Circle office

Refer
Continue note
27.5.09

Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

Dated Bangalore. 25th May 1909.

From

B. J. Kumaraswamy Naik Esquire B.A.,

Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

To

K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar Esquire B.A.,B.L.,

Secy.to the Govt.of H.H.the Maharaja of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments, Muzrai Branch,

BANGALORE.

Adverting to your docket No.687 of the 14th August 1908 nd subsequent reminder No.1233/Muz.F.101-08 of the 4th March 1909 , n the matter of the records relating to the passing of Captain udlow's order, disallowing the claim of one Buran Sha Khadri of the kkal Sha Khadri Darga at Channapatna, I have the honor to state that he Sub-Division Officer of Closepet who was addressed in the matter eports in his docket No.250 of the 17/19th May 1909, that the said ecords are not forthcoming either in his Office, or , in the hannapatna Taluk Office.

2. The two files of vernacular records returned with your ocket under reply are herewith resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

or e t Commissioner.

Reference

S.A. 19.2.09

W

(5) Digest

WP(C) 401-08-38

D632

101-08-37

19.1.07

Muz LA]

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

Muz F 15-8-07

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B.A,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department

36-94

To

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

Dated

Despatched 14.8.08.

Received

General No. 687
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No. 1 to 2

As requested in his D.O. of the 5th instant, has the honour to forward herewith the file of Vernacular papers received with his letter No. 140 dated 24th June 1908 and [illegible]

request that the [illegible]

be returned [illegible]

GPB—2,000—7 2 06

with the Correspondence that

led to the passing of Captain

Sudlow's Orders.

By Orders,

[illegible]

for Secretary to Govt,

Museum Department

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
593
Bangalore,
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT
August 1908.

Dear sir,

With reference to your D.O.letter dated the 22nd July 1908, regarding the claim of one Buransha Khadri for an allowance of Rs.5-8-0 from the Akhalsha Khadri Darga at Chennapatna, I herewith forward copy of Chief Commissioner's Proceedings No.6478-98 dated the 29th September 1876 referred to therein.

As for the vernacular file containing Captain Ludlow's Order disallowing the claim of the petition, a search was made in the records of this Office but it could not be traced out. Orders have been issued to the Amildar of the Chennapatna Taluk to search in his Office Records and to send the file if found. In the meanwhile, I request you to kindly retransmit for reference and resubmission the file of vernacular papers forwarded with this

this Office No.140 dated the 20th June 1908.

Yours sincerely,

C. S. Balasundaram Aiyar Esquire B.A.,
Under Secretary, Muzrai Department,
BANGALORE.

(6)

PROCEEDINGS of the CHIEF COMMISSIONER of MYSORE.

R e a d :- Petition from Syed Mahomed Sultan Mohideen Shah Khadri , Makandar, Chennapatna in the Closepet Taluk, complaining that the Taluk Authorities disburse the Government allowance of Rs.121-8-2 to the several recipients instead of allowing him to do so.

Letters from Commissioner of the Mundydroog Division, Nos.74 G and 138 G dated 12th May and 6th July 1876.

Order thereon No.6478/F.98 dated 29th September 1876.

Having received the Proceedings in the case, the Chief Com-missioner observed that as the Petitioner Syed Mahomed Sultan Mohideen Shah Khadri is the recognised Makandar of Akkal Shah -- Khadri's Durga at Chennapatna, all payments and allowances connect-ed with the Institution should be disbursed through him. He may however, be required to keep a regular acquittance roll for the sums so disbursed and to submit the same to the Amildar or Deputy Commissioner, either monthly or quarterly as may be directed.

2. To prevent the recurrence of disputes between the Makandar and some of the recipients of the allowances, a list of the ---- authorized pensioners or annuities to be allotted from the Darga grant should be prepared and filed by the Makandar which, after approval of the local authorities, should be adhered to and no deviation therefrom allowed.

3. The Makandar should be informed that he cannot dismiss any of the servants of the Makkan or discontinue any of the authorized allowances without the previous sanction of the Deputy Commissioner, and no extra expenditure of any kind should be incurred -- without obtaining such sanction. He should be further warned that any failure on his part to disburse the legitimate dues to the

parties

parties entitled, will entail his removal from Office - subject to the limitations above laid down, the Wakandar's powers to regulate the internal management and affairs of the Durga should not be -- interfered with.

4. Buran Pacha, the illegitimate grandson of Sharafoo Bee, whose claim to an allowance of Rs.3-10-8 has been disallowed by Captain Ludlow, may be referred to the Civil Court. If Pootoo Bee left -- any other sons or daughters, besides the two individuals now ---- enjoying her allowance, it should be rateably distributed amon all the children as suggested by the Deputy Commissioner.

5. The Proceedings are herewith returned, and the Commission requested to communicate these Orders to the parties concerned

Sd/- T. G. Clerke.
Offg: Secretary.

&&&&&&&&&&&&

"C O P Y".

Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

B.N.S.

59 D. V.

Muz. 1]

190

From

Judicial

To

B. J. Kumarasami Naick Esqr., B.A.,
Deputy Commr., Bangalore.

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Judicial 88
27/10/07

Dear Mr. Kumarasami Naick,

The case re the claim of Buran Sha Khadri for the allce of Rs 5-8-0 per mensem from the Akhal Sha Khadri Dargah at Channapatna, was heard before Govt on the 11th instant. Buran Sha Khadri was not present. But Syed Md. Hussein Badsha Khadri, one of the hereditary and a member on the managing Committee of the Dargah who was present at the hearing and who objected to the claim of Buran Sha Khadri [illegible]

GPL—3,000—19-9-07

based his contention on the late Chief Commissioner's Pro: no 6478/98 dated 29th Sept 1876, which, he stated, made mention of Capt Dudlow's Order disallowing the claim of Buran Sha on the ground of his being the illegitimate grandson of Sherfu Bee, one of the Khadedars of the Darga from whom he claimed his ~~sha~~ allce. He further contended that those Proceedings directed the said individual to establish his claim in Civil Court, but that he did not do so.

In these circs, I shall feel obliged if you will kindly cause a search to be made in the records of your Office and send me Capt. Dudlow's Order and the Chief Commr's Proceedings referred to, either in original or copies thereof, and also all the records of enquiry which led to the passing of those orders for reference at a very early date.

Yours Sincerely
1887

Wm Hart

61

1907-8.

From

The Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore Dist.

To

The Secy. to the Govt. of Mysore
Revenue Deptt.

Dated 20th

Despatched June 1908.

Received

General No.

In. No 142

Enclosure No.

His No. 5538 of 12.6.08

Forwarded the records
re the Makkan allowance
enjoyed by Ghouse Sha
Khadri of Channapatna

MYSORE
5179
25/6/08

QA
25.6.1908

Please give me all
the papers on the
with MS 1908. The case
is posted for hearing
on the 4th

29/6/08

Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

I.S.No.447. Dated Bangalore 20th June 1908.

From

B. J. Kumaraswamy Naik Esquire B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District.

To

L. Anantaswamy Rao Esquire B.A.,
Secy.to the Govt.of H.H.the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

With reference to your docket No.5538 dated the th June 1908, regarding the Makkan Allowance of Rs.5-8-0 enjoyed Ghous-sha Khadri of Chennapatna, I have the honor to state that records were received with Government Proceedings No.4014-6 of e 16th March 1908.

The file of Vernacular Records received with Government der No.3886-8/Muz.F.36-94 dated the 16th June 1904 is herewith rwarded as called for in the docket under reference.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

(47)

Mur. 1 A]

190

From

To

The Dy Commr
Bangalore Distt.

Dated

Despatched 12/6/1908

Received

General No. 5538

No.

Enclosure No.

Adverting to Govt.
Secs no HOM-6 dated 16th
March 1908 sanctioning
the payment to Syed Buran
Sha Khadri of Srinivasapur
of the monthly allowance
of Rs 5-8-0 enjoyed by his
grandfather Ghous Sha
Khadri from the Akbal
Sha Khadri Dargah

G.P.B.—3,000—21-7-06

Chennapatnam, has the honor
to state that Syed Mahomed
Hussain Sahiba Khadri
has memorialized H.H.
the Maharaja praying
for a re-consideration of
the foregoing order and the
case has been posted for
hearing before Court on
the 11th inst July 1908. The Dy.
Commr is requested to
re-submit for reference the
entire file of records bearing
on the subject. The Vernacular Records recd with the
Govt Pro: No 3886-8 dated 16th June 1904 shd also be submd
in time. Tuz 736-94 By order,

Sd/ 10/6/08
Secretary.

10/6/08

65

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No. 2809
1

Zenhill, Ooty, 19.5. 1908

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4711
21.5.08
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

Received & Noted
Please req. & submit
once. Orders have been
issued in the matter.
TW 21/5/08

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, in the Muzrai Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

No. 1376 of 07-08

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

To

His Highness
Sri Krishna Rajendra Wodeyar Bahadur
G C S I
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Mysore





May it please your enlightened Royal Highness Syed Buran Sha Khadri of Timmasandra village, Kankanhalli Taluk, a loyal and humble subject of your Highness most humbly craves permission to approach your Highness with the following few lines trusting fully that his request may be favourably attended to.

With reference to his memorial Reg. no. 873 - 2761/1634 dated 6th. January 1908, regarding his claim for the monthly allowance of Rs 5-8-0 from the Akhal Sha Khadri Darga at Channapatna, the Petitioner is glad to state that he has been informed that the Government of your Highness, are pleased to sanction the payment to him with effect from the 18th February last.

In the mean time, one Syed Mahomed Hussain Bhadsha Khadri has put in a petition to the Government of your Highness to show that the petitioner is not a legal claimant of Gous Sha Khadri and the allowance sanctioned thereby.

is unlawful and that therefore the Petitioner's claim should be rejected and the allowance he receives should be ceased

It is evident that your Highness after kind and careful perusal of all the records relating to the Petitioner's claims for the allowance, thereby sanctioned the payment to him which had been pending for the last 5 or 6 years. and which had been previously rejected by the 1st. Councillor and the Mazrai Secretary

In chief Commissioner's Proceedings - no. 6478/98 dated 29th September 1876, the - Petitioner was referred to the Civil Court for establishing his right and title to the allowance. and from a careful enquiry held on the spot, it was satisfactorily established that the Petitioner is the lawful claimant of Gous. Sha. Khadri.

Some 5 or 6 years back the Petitioner was asked to give an oral Statement before mr. Ahamad Ali, the then assistant Commissioner at Closepet with regard to his claim for the allowance of Rs. 5-8-0 payable to Gous. Sha. Khadri.

Last year the Petitioner was examined by the 1st. Councillor, and the Mazrai Secretary to the same fact.

After so many trials and consideration it was finally settled that the Petitioner is the legal claimant of Gous. Sha. Khadri and that

he should receive the allowance Rs 5-8-0
from last February.

But, the Petitioner unfortunately received from the Office of the Monzrai - Secretary a Notice stating that he should be present at his Office for enquiry regarding the above mentioned allowance How many times is he to be enquired of the same fact over and over!

It has become habitual to Syed Mahomed Hussain Bhadsha Khadri, who is a cousin of the Petitioner even from the time of his grandfather to put in false petitions not only against the Petitioner's ancestors but also against the Manager of the Makkan and others then & the He is not a man of noble Characters. He is not respected among the Public. He has not had or received any education during his early age He cannot write his own name. Some 25 or 2 years ago he & his brothers paid a heavy fine of Rs. 350 in a deceit case. Though he is entitled to a small allowance of Rs. 2 per mensem he unjustly receives the stipend of 5 other deceased female claimants who were related to him as the maternal aunts, amounting to a sum of Rs 1 per mensem. Such a man is appointed, as one of the Nazarine-ow-Koffs of the institution The other 4 are also of the same Characters

They are thorough unfit to be appointed to such posts as Nazarine-on-Koffs. The makkan is still in a dilapidated Condition. The allowance Rs. 14. 15. 6 which is to be spent on Coloos, Fateya etc. has been mis-appropriated by the present Nazarine-on-Koffs for their own personal benefit and the amount drawn for persons who have no concern with the makkan is utilized by the same members. These do not act really as Dharmadarsis at Hindu Temples. The Taluk Amildar does not hold an enquiry into the matter. The Taluk Office wants the Nazarine-on-Koffs to do the needful when there is any occasion for it What could these illiterate and selfish creatures do with their scanty Knowledge? Have they so much spirit and energy to dispose of matters in a skilful way? No, a bad workman quarrels with his tools.

Even from the time of the Petitioner's grand father there has been bitter enmity between the two cousins. To prove this, the Petitioner has herewith sent a copy of the Razinama executed by the grandfather of Sd. Mahomed Hussain Shadsha Khadri

in favour of the Petitioner's grandfather.
The former is not a near cousin of the Petitioner and he has no interest in the estate of the latter. He owns a separate garden for his share which is in the possession and enjoyment of the said Bhadsha Khadri from the time of his grandfather.

As the Petitioner is quite weary in giving evidence in presence of so many officers and in so many occasions, the Petitioner will still be glad and ready to give evidence in this matter only in presence of your Highness, if it be thought necessary.

The matter once settled by your Highness has no reason to be brought for reconsideration. The Petitioner has already received his allowance for the last three months. The Petitioner was very ill when he received a notice from the office of the Mugra Secretariat to make his appearance again to give evidence regarding the same matter. Respectable gentlemen come forward to give evidence that Syed Mahomed Hussain Bhadsha Khadri is a man of loose character. About the mismanagement of the Makkan, any one can say boldly that it is necessary that the present Nazarine-en-Koff should be replaced by well read and respectable Hindu gentlemen and merchants. All the money that is to be spent for festivals and

and religious ceremonies has been wrongly made use of by the Nazaine -on- Koffs.

Such being the case, the petitioner most humbly begs your Highness to dismiss the present Nazarine -on- Koffs and replace them by well-educated and respectable Hindu gentlemen and reject the petition of Syed Mahomed Hussain Bhadsha-Khadrie, warning him not to put in such false petitions hereafter.

Further the petitioner begs your Highness that if any inquiry is necessary about the allowance he receives at present, he shall be glad to appear before your Highness in person and give statement satisfactorily to the fact.

"For to whom else is he to represent his wants! "Is it not natural to the suckling even though it be spurned by the mother in wrath not loose its hold of the foot that spurns!"

May the blessings of the Bhagavan Sri Rama Chandra be on your Highness's family forever & ever. That your Highness may live long for the good of many and for the spread of Truth, is the constant Prayer of

Dated the 13th of may 1908.
Thimmasandra

Your Highness's most obedient servant

ಕೆಂಪು ಕಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಲಾದ ಈ ಕೋಟೆಯ ಸುತ್ತಳತೆ ಸುಮಾರು 2 ಕಿಲೋಮೀಟರ್‌ಗಳಷ್ಟಿದೆ. ಕೋಟೆಯ ಒಳಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಐತಿಹಾಸಿಕ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ದೇವಾಲಯಗಳಿವೆ. ಪ್ರವಾಸಿಗರು ಕೋಟೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನಿಂದ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಸುಂದರ ದೃಶ್ಯವನ್ನು ವೀಕ್ಷಿಸಬಹುದು. ಕೋಟೆಯ ಒಳಗೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶಿಸಲು ಟಿಕೆಟ್ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಟಿಕೆಟ್ ದರ ವಯಸ್ಕರಿಗೆ ₹50 ಮತ್ತು ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ₹20 ಆಗಿದೆ. ಕೋಟೆಯ ಆವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಛಾಯಾಗ್ರಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಶುಲ್ಕವಿದೆ.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

Fernhill, Ooty, 14th April 1908.

No. 2509
1



Please put up file
Hz Burzan Sha Khadri alias
Pir Akbal Sha Khadri Dargah file.
14/4/08

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, in the Muzrai Department, Bangalore, for submission of papers in the case.

No. 1248 of 07-08.

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

13.4.06

4207

18.4.06

[illegible]

بجهة سید محمد حسینی یادش ه تا داری

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4107

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೯೬೫ ರ ಕಲಂ ೧೨೯ ರಡಿ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಉಲ್ಲೇಖ: ಮಾನ್ಯ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ದಂಡಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು, ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಇವರ ಆದೇಶ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಿಆರ್ಬಿ/೧೭೬೯/೨೦೧೭ ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೨೭-೧೨-೨೦೧೭

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯ ಮತ್ತು ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ದಂಡಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು, ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಇವರು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಅಧಿನಿಯಮ ೧೯೬೫ ರ ಕಲಂ ೧೨೯ ರಡಿ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಆದೇಶಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಈ ಜ್ಞಾಪನದೊಂದಿಗೆ ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿದೆ. ಆದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಂಡು ಅನುಪಾಲನಾ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲು ಕೋರಿದೆ.

ಲಗತ್ತು: ಮೇಲಿನಂತೆ.

ಪೊಲೀಸ್ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು, ಬೆಳಗಾವಿ ನಗರ

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Mysore 4th April 1908.

No. 2401/2

4057 4/4/08

Petitions as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, are transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Mysore Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

No. 1179+1180 of 07-08.

By Order,

I C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharajah of Mysore.

1179

ಸಂಪಿಗೆಯ ಕೆರೆಯ ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಅವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯವರು ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರು
ಇವರಿಗೆ ಇಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಗಳು ಅವಳ ಹೆಸರು ಮಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮ ಅವಳಿಗೆ
ಸುಮಾರು 330 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ ಅವಳಿಗೆ ಮದುವೆ ಆಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

ಸಂಪಿಗೆಯ ಕೆರೆಯ ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯವರು ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ
ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ವಿವರ

ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 5 - 8 - 0
ಹಿಸ್ಸಾ ನಂ 2 - 11 - 0
ಹಿಸ್ಸಾ ನಂ 4 - 10 - 0
12 - 13 - 0

ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರ
ಜಮೀನು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ

ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 5 - 8 ಇರುತ್ತದೆ
ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡಿ
ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದ ಬೆಳೆಯನ್ನು ನಾಶ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ
ಇದರಿಂದ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು 25 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ನಷ್ಟ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ
ಈ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರು ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಸು
ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡಿ
ಬೆಳೆಯನ್ನು ನಾಶ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರು
ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಸು ಹಾಕಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ
ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಸು ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಕೇಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರು
ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡಿ ಬೆಳೆಯನ್ನು
ನಾಶ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಸು
ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಕೇಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರು
ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡಿ ಬೆಳೆಯನ್ನು
ನಾಶ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಸು
ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಿರುವ ಕೇಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರು
ಸಂಪಿಗೆ ಅರಸಪ್ಪನವರ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಮಾಡಿ ಬೆಳೆಯನ್ನು
ನಾಶ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಅಂಕಮ್ಮನವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಸು
ಹಾಕಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

Proceedings of Commissioner of Mysore

(65)

Read

Moved

Petition from Sri [illegible] No. [illegible] Shekhadar of Channapatna in the Closepet Taluk [illegible] authorities disburse Government allowance [illegible] several recipients instead of allowing [illegible]

Letters from [illegible]

Division No. 74 of 1891 Dated 2nd May and 6th [illegible] 1876 —

order thereon no 6478/98 of 29th [illegible]

the proceedings in the case of [illegible] petitioner Syed Mir Mian Mohyuddin Saheb Kadri Shekhadar of Akkal Shah Kadri [illegible] ments and allowances connected [illegible] him he may however be required to [illegible] the sums so disbursed and [illegible] Deputy Commissioner either [illegible]

2) To prevent the recurrence of disputes between the Mukhtar and some of the recipients of the [illegible] ised pensions and or annuities [illegible] should be prepared and filled by the Shekhadar [illegible] approval by the local authorities should [illegible] deviation thereupon allowed.

(3) The Makandar should be [illegible] any of the wants of the [illegible] ised allowances without [illegible] Commissioner and no [illegible] incurred without [illegible] ned further that [illegible] ate dues to the [illegible] Office subject to the conditions above [illegible] dars [illegible] regulate the internal [illegible] of the Durga should not be [illegible]

4 Baran [illegible] Allegiriyate [illegible] whose claim to an allowance [illegible] 3-10-8 has been [illegible] the [illegible] may be refused by the [illegible] left any other sons or daughters [illegible] enjoying [illegible] the children as suggested by [illegible]

(5) The proceedings are hereby [illegible] and [illegible] communicate their orders to the [illegible]

Nandidroog Division.

No 686

Nandidroog Division Commissioner office.

Bangalore 7th oct. 76

Office memorandum

Copy of the foregoing forwarded to the Dy Commissioner of the Bangalore District with the request that the chief Commissioner's orders may be ..... as speedily as possible.

(2) The various proceedings connected with the case with the Commissioner No 150 of 15th April last are here with returned.

(Signed) Jh. Pearse

Commissioner

పెనిసిలిన్ ఇంజక్షన్ ధర ఎంత ఉంటుంది?

ఎవరు ఇంజక్షన్ ఇవ్వాలి?

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಸಿಆಸುಇ ೨೯೯ ಸಿಎಸ್‌ಆರ್ ೨೦೧೭

ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಆಯುಕ್ತರು ಹಾಗೂ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳ ಮುಖ್ಯಸ್ಥರು ಮತ್ತು ಅಧೀನ ಕಚೇರಿಗಳು

ವಿಷಯ: ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ಆದಾಯ ಕುರಿತು.

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ಆದಾಯ ಕುರಿತು ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಲು ಕೋರಲಾಗಿದೆ.

೧. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ಆದಾಯವನ್ನು ಕಾಲಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ನಿಗದಿಪಡಿಸುವ ಮಾನದಂಡಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು.

೨. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ಆದಾಯವನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೊತ್ತದಿಂದ ಭಾಗಿಸಿ ಬಂದ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಶೇಕಡಾವಾರು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು.

೩. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ಆದಾಯವನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೊತ್ತದಿಂದ ಭಾಗಿಸಿ ಬಂದ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಶೇಕಡಾವಾರು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು.

೪. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ಆದಾಯವನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೊತ್ತದಿಂದ ಭಾಗಿಸಿ ಬಂದ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಶೇಕಡಾವಾರು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು.

೫. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೇಲಿನ ಆದಾಯವನ್ನು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಉದ್ಯಮಗಳ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹೂಡಿಕೆಯ ಮೊತ್ತದಿಂದ ಭಾಗಿಸಿ ಬಂದ ಮೊತ್ತವನ್ನು ಶೇಕಡಾವಾರು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಸಹಿ/-
(ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಕುಲಕರ್ಣಿ)
ಅಪರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಸರ್ಕಾರ

Notes.

Buran Cha Khadri's Case.

The Darga at Channapatna has a monthly grant of Rs 121/- and odd, out of which about Rs 84 or 69/- are distributed among the descendants of Akbal Cha Khadri as stipends for maintenance.

An establishment costing Rs 16/- or 19/- a month is maintained

2) This is an application for the revision of Govt. order No. 4014-6 D/16th March 1908 issued under the orders of His Highness to the effect that one Buran Cha Khadri is entitled to the allowance of Rs 6:8-0 a month which his grand-uncle Gouse Cha Khadri was getting in the Akbal Cha Khadri Makkan

The grounds for review as gathered from the several petitions appear to be these:—

(1) That [illegible]

is not the legitimate grand-nephew
of Gouse Sha Khadri, that the
question of Buran Sha Khadri's
legitimacy was considered in
(8)6 and Buran Sha Khadri
was directed to establish it.
(ii) That Gouse Sha Khadri
executed a will bequeathing
his amount to his daughter's
son Saheb Peera, that the
latter was enjoying his after
the former's death and that
on the death of Saheb Peera
and his widow's remarriage
the amount lapsed to the
Makkan funds.
(iii) That at the enquiry held
by Mr. Ahmed Ali, Buran
Sha Khadri has agreed to
this sum of Rs 5-8-0 being
saved for use for other purposes
of the Makkan and is therefore
estopped from claiming it

) The circumstances which
led to the passing of the
order sought to be reviewed
and the reasons for passing it
will be clear from the notes
in File Nos

) The complaints about this
Institution which commenced
in or about 1860 when Sultan
Mohadeen Sha Khadri
succeeded his father as Mokhtesar
have continued with more or less
interruption till now

On receipt of certain
petitions in 1899 and subsequent
years Mr. Ahmed Mitchell
an enquiry and made some
recommendations one of
which was that Buran Sha
Khadri Sheds be paid Rs 3.10.8
a month which his grand-
mother Sharfu Bi was getting.
In that connection the
proceedings of 1876 are
briefly referred to and distinct
with the observation "that
"from a careful enquiry held
by me on the spot, it has
been satisfactorily established
that the present claimant
Syed Buran Sha Khadri is the
lawful eldest son of Hussain
Pacha. Respecting the status
of the place that [illegible]
[illegible]

Marriage of the Petitioners
is to the Hussain Pacha.
The other parties have offered
no evidence to prove their
plea, viz, that Syed Buran
Sha Khadri was not the issue
of a legal marriage. This
plea is easy of averment
but difficult to prove.
2. Therefore, we commend that
the Shipensof Rs 3-10-8
payable to Shoorfa Bi be
transferred to the name of
Buran Sha Khadri, the legal
grandson of the deceased Bibi."

) This recommendation
was approved

Thus the way for claiming
your Sha Khadri's pension
also was prepared and
Buran Sha Khadri applied
for the same. The question of
legitimacy was not then
disputed. Nevertheless, it
was not thought necessary
to admit his claim. This
view was not approved by
His Highness.

) After the issue of the order of March 1908

the opposite parts have come forward and urged grounds for not admitting Buran Ra Khadri's Claim.

Before proceeding further it may be useful to discuss what the effect of not recognising the Claim will be. The Govt. advocate has said that there are evidently hereditary allowances and that they can only lapse when heirs in all branches of the family fail. Thus if we say that Buran Shah Khadri is not entitled to the sum of Rs 6-8-0, others will be entitled to claim it, and if as in this case we are not to apply the law of limitation strictly then others will have to get their allowances and the amount cannot be saved for the purposes of the Mahkan. In that case it does not appear to be necessary to discuss the genuineness or legitimacy of [illegible]

) If on the other hand it is now settled that on the event of Burau Sha Khadri not having the heir, the amount is to be saved and that others Common claim it as they have not claimed it till now the question of legitimacy &c., can be considered.

) I have gone over all the available papers relating to the proceedings of 1876 when naturally better evidence should have been available, about the legitimacy of Burau Sha Khadri that during the enquiry held by Dr. Ahmed Shah in 1903. A Nakedabone, the Superintendent of Mismanagement Commenced about the year 1864 when Sultan Mohadeen Sha Khadri became manager in place of his father. He says that no scale of expenditure had been fixed and that he was spending the

X. 2109

(45) Money as his predecessor did,
i.e., just as he liked. Attempts
were made to introduce some
system which, however, the
manager did not conform
to. In 1874 Shurfa Bi referred
to in the genealogical table
above as the heirs of one
Pattu Bi complained that
they had not been paid their
dues.

The Amildar held an
enquiry. The manager
Sultain Mohadeen Sha Khadri
said that Shurfa Bi's son
Hayath Pacha was getting
his father's allowance of
Rs 5/8/0 and that after his
(Hayath Pacha's) death, it
was paid to his widow
Jumêr Bi and his son Buran
Sha Khadri. He added that
Jumêr Bi was the 2nd and
not the married wife of Hayath
Pacha and that he could adduce
satisfactory evidence in
support thereof. As regards
the complaint of Pattu's
heirs he said that one
Shamsudeen, the [illegible]
of Pattu, [illegible]

paid the allowance from
a long time.

) To evidence as
to existence of
legitimacy, the Amildar
examined Haji Kasim × Hug 7
from some persons to the
effect that Jumêr Bi
was neither the married
nor ~~widow~~ wife of Hayat
Pasha; nor was Jumêr Bi
and Buran Pasha called
upon to prove the marriage
and legitimacy.

The Amildar reported × Hug 6
that Shurfa Bi showed yes
Rs 3-10-8 according to the
deed of Nana executed × Hug
by her husband and
for her sons Concubine
and that Pultoo Bi's
other heirs showed also
written a share in her
stipend.

(9)

DIARY No 1325

R

11-12-12

Mus

VII

Defences

26.2.12

ఏ కే చూ చి కి లాం ది కు చే ది ద్వా చూ న ం చ్ చూ చ క్ష్ చి ద్వి ది
ambulance కి ప్ప చా గు త్తి. బ ది ద్వి ది ల ర చ చే ల కు ం చి చు డా
స్వ కం చూ గా ప్ప వే చూ ది మొ ది చే ర, ఇ కి చూ ర్చే ది -

24-2-1912 కి

మీ విధేయ సేవకుడు సయ్యద్ మహమ్మద్ హుసేన్ బిన్ సయ్యద్ మహమ్మద్ బాదుషా మాదరీ

G.R.S. 26]

Pubp [illegible] 6/8/09
Draft to [illegible]

File No.

Serial No

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

No.

General and Rev. Secretariat
( )
, the 190 .

To

The Dy Commr,
Bangalore Dist

Date of issue 7th August 09

Signed by Mr. A. S. Myer

Sir,

Adverting to your letter no. 118 Dy 25th May 1909 ~~submitting~~ forwarding (herewith) ~~the records~~ relating to Captain Ludlow's order disallowing the claim ~~of Buran Shah Khadri of the~~ Akhal Shah Khadri Darga at Channapatna, I am directed to request you to send copies of Nandidurg Commissioner's letters nos. 74 G and 138 G dated 12th May 1876 and 6th July 1876 and also ~~to look into the accounts and~~ report if as stated in the mahazar Dy 26th October 1905, a will was executed after enquiry into the accounts over.

vide copy (Flag L)

SUBJECT.

5 Shewing the Khadri in favour of the petitioner

on the 4th Decr 1846 and ~~Gouse~~

if the Khadri after ~~Shaw~~ the latter's death the latter took

~~Shaw Khadri's daughters~~ Only Dhee

getting the allowance and if after

his death, it lapsed. It should

also be reported if ever after

the death of Gouse Shaw Khadri

and Sherfoo Bibi, Buran Shaw

Khadri asserted his right to

their allowances

2) The favor of a very early

reply is requested

3) The Vern records together

with the Review Petition no 4046

and its ~~enclosures~~ enclosures, are

herewith returned for reference and

re-submission

I have &c

By Order

Dbt)

Sr Secretary

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

MGCPB—20,000-10-12—04

No. 402 encl 2 files

From M.7.158—07

The Secretary to the Government of His Highnsss
the Maharaja of Mysore, Genl. and Rev. Depts.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Dated the 7th August 1909

Genl. and Rev
Secretariat.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. 118 dated 25th May 1909 submitting the records about the Akhalsha Khadri Darga at Channapatna, I am directed to request you to send copies of Nandidoorg Commissioner's letters Nos. 74 G & 138 G dated 12th May 1876 and 6th July 1876 and also to report after reference to the accounts if as stated in the abstract dated 26th October 1905, a will was executed on the 7th December 1876 by Gouse Sha Khadri in favour of his daughter's son, if after Gouse Sha Khadri's death the later was getting the allowance and if after his death, it lapsed. It should also be reported if ever after the death of Gouse Sha Sha Khadri and Sherfoo Bibi, Puran Sha Khadri asserted his right to their allowances.

The vernacular records together with the Revenue petition No. 4046 and its enclosures, are herewith returned for reference and re-submission.

GPP—S000-14.07

I have the honor to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

(Fair draft) By Addl Secy

For Secretary to Government

C. K. M.,

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

( )

the 191

927 One one bundle of records (3 files)

Date of issue 10-9-1909 To

Signed by Mr. A. Mityanjayadeva

The Dy Comm.

Bangalore Dt.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith the vernacular records connected with the case of Akkal Sha Khadri Darga at Chandrapatna, the further enquiry in the case has been stopped for lack of interested persons sufficiently interested in the matter.

over.

I have the

Forwarded with your letter No. 23 dt. 14. Nov. 1910. As it is considered that no further enquiry in the matter is necessary

For Secy. to Govt.

VB 3.9.09. Bly. Asst. Secy.